

PUBLIC SAFETY & PUBLIC INFORMATION COMMITTEE
of the
Suffolk County Legislature

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Public Safety & Public Information Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **September 3, 2003**.

Members Present:

Legislator Angie Carpenter - Chairperson
Legislator Joseph Caracappa - Vice-Chair
Legislator David Bishop
Legislator William Lindsay
Legislator Andrew Crecca
Legislator George Guldi
Legislator Peter O'Leary

Also In Attendance:

Doug Sutherland - Aide to Legislator Carpenter
Tim Laube - Aide to Legislator Lindsay
Maria Ammirati - Aide to Legislator O'Leary
Anthony Figliola - Aide to Presiding Officer Postal
Rosalind Gazes - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office
Joe Muncy - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Bill Faulk - County Executive's Office/Intergovernmental Relations
Donald Sullivan - Undersheriff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Alan Otto - Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Joseph Rubacka - Lieutenant/Suffolk County Sheriff's Office
Tedd Godek - Suffolk County Architect/Department of Public Works
John Gallagher - Commissioner/Suffolk County Police Department
James Abbott - Chief Deputy Commissioner/Suffolk County Police Dept
James Maggio - Deputy Commissioner/Suffolk County Police Department
Donald Papavero - Lieutenant/Suffolk County Police Department
David Fischler - Commissioner/Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services
Tom O'Hara - Fire, Rescue & Emergency Services
Mike Pirone - Suffolk County Police Department
Debbie Eppel - Public Information Office
Artie Cliff - President/Superior Officer's Association
Alexandra Sullivan - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 1:04 P.M.*)

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Hi. Good afternoon and welcome to the Public Safety Committee. And I'd like to give a special welcome to our newest member, Legislator Peter O'Leary, and ask him to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Salutation

Thank you. We have no cards. I heard a subtle yeah there in the background.

LEG. BISHOP:

That's Doug, he's doing good work eating the cards as they come in.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

But we have some correspondence that I wanted to share with you to begin with from the Sheriff regarding the DWI Facility and the need for additional funding over the appropriated amount. And I have photographs that I'd like to pass around and I would ask the representatives from the Sheriff's Department if you would just come forward. Did everyone get copies of the photos? All right, then I don't need to pass them around. Okay, thank you.

We had had a meeting and the old picture speaks a thousand words, I thought it would be helpful if we could see some of the examples of the need for the replacement of this facility. And if anyone has any questions or you gentlemen want to make some comments, go right ahead.

CHIEF OTTO:

Possibly just a real short comment. In this particular case, pictures really don't do justice for the conditions of the DWI Facility, the reason being -- it's probably best if DPW, you know, if need be make a comment. The damage and the condition of the DWI Facility, okay, is basically concerned with the structure which is under the building itself, the supports, the frame. Some of the pictures you'll see, you'll see a big strip right down the middle of the two trailers and it looks like there's a metal plate, there is a metal plate that's holding the two halves together because it's rotted out underneath, the metal beams. So it's mostly structural damage and these photos just give you a little bit of a glimpse of the problem since it's not really a hundred percent full picture.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Does anyone have any questions?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, I have a question. How many prisoners will the facility as designed hold?

CHIEF OTTO:

The new one would be 85.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Eighty-five. Where did the appropriated 3.4 million come from; was that the original estimate in '94?

2

CHIEF OTTO:

That was the original estimate for the Capital Project.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And it was never increased?

CHIEF OTTO:

We had requested an increase at one time for how much, Joe, about a half of million? Yeah, it originally started two point -- about \$2 million for construction, 202,000 for planning, 141,000 for equipment. And then in 1998 when it was finally approved and for the 1999-2001 Capital Program, the cost elements were increased from the original figures; they increased for 300,000 for planning which is just a \$100,000 increase, three million for construction in 2001 and 200,000 for equipment. Okay, then in the 2001-2002 Capital Program it was increased again, the total requested for the project was to be increased by \$548,000; 330,000 was for planning, 100,000 for site work, 3.4 million for construction and then 200,000 for equipment which remained the same.

And then again, Resolution No. 166-2000 appropriated 330,000 for planning and 100,000 for the site improvements. And the final resolution, Resolution 996-2001, appropriated the 3.4 for construction and 200,000 for furniture and equipment. We have an information sheet here which tracks the entire project; if you want I'll make copies for everybody, you can see what happened.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I think that would be a good idea, but it's absolutely bizarre that a bid would come in that far out of whack. You know, \$2.1 million on a three four project is really crazy. I mean, I'm just looking for the rationale of why.

CHIEF OTTO:

I tried to find out, I couldn't get an answer other than the fact that's what the lowest bid was.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

I notice that Tedd Godek is here from the Department of Public Works and I think it might be helpful if he comes forward and he might be able to shed some light on this.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Chair, I have a question. Am I to understand that there's been absolutely no construction at all on something that's been appropriated and approved since 2001 with respect to the facility?

CHIEF OTTO:

That's correct.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And the reason for that is because the bid was 2.1 over?

CHIEF OTTO:

Right, the bid that just recently opened up was 2.1 over the adopted amount.

3

LEG. O'LEARY:

But what has happened since 2001 with respect to addressing the needs of renovating the facility, nothing whatsoever?

CHIEF OTTO:

I think you may want to direct that to DPW.

MR. GODEK:

We have been in the design process for quite a period of time on this building. I don't know that I've got a distinct answer for you as to why this thing came in so high. We sat down with the low bidders on the project after we took the bids and the answer was, "That's how we value the project." Now, there have been some scope increases, some items that we ran into during the design process since the last appropriation and we've realized as we were getting close to bid time that we were getting dangerously close to what we had available to build this thing, but the decision was made to bid it.

Rather than speculate how far we might be off at any point in time, we decided to go out to the marketplace with it, let the contractors tell us what the project is worth at this period of time. And we got good responses on this bid; we got nine general construction bids, ten plumbing, nine HVAC and 18 electrical bids. People looked at this job and, unfortunately, when they looked at it they came in quite a bit over what we had available to build it.

LEG. LINDSAY:
May I, Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Absolutely, go right ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Tedd, is there any available engineering that can be done on the project? Did you hear what I said?

MR. GODEK:
Yes, I did.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Good.

MR. GODEK:
There is always a certain amount of value engineering that you can do with any project. We have decided -- well, we've decided to go and see if we can build the building as it's designed. If we get into too much value engineering, the building loses its ability to service the program that the Sheriff has set for it; we hesitate to do that. The building right now is well suited for the program, it will be a model structure when it's completed. But to answer your question, yes, there is that ability to do that.

LEG. LINDSAY:
So are we going to do that? I mean, if we appropriate additional money for this, are we going with the existing bids or are you's going to put it out for rebid?

4

MR. GODEK:
No, the existing money or the money that we're asking for under this resolution allows us to go with the existing bids.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay.

MR. GODEK:
The contractors have been queried, they are willing to hold their bids until such time as the resolution is approved and the monies properly appropriated.

(*Legislator Crecca entered the meeting at 1:13 P.M.*)

If we go into a value engineering situation, then we are definitely into a rebid. We go back to the drawing board, so to speak, and

probably won't get the project out until next year sometime.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And I think it was important, I know when we had had the meeting, that it wasn't just a matter of just one bid coming in so high, that they were all hovering around that same amount; is that not correct?

MR. GODEK:

Yes, we've gotten -- like I said, we got a good response; it's not like we just got a couple of off-the-wall bids on these contracts. The contractors looked at them and, as I said before, that's the way they value the project.

LEG. LINDSAY:

There's no room in the bid document to do any value engineering if you award --

MR. GODEK:

Well, no, there are no alternates taken at this point. What we're asking for here reflects strictly a base bid situation.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay, are you done?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay. Are there any other questions or comments on this? Legislator Bishop.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes, I have -- sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Bishop and then Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. BISHOP:

I yield.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

He yielded to you.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Is this facility currently being utilized?

CHIEF OTTO:

Yes, it is.

LEG. O'LEARY:

It is? And on average, how many people are lodged?

CHIEF OTTO:

It can hold 44, sometimes it's full and sometimes it's not. As of an average a year, I would have to figure that out.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right. And with respect to my initial question, I'm still curious as to why this has just languished, if you will, since 2001; is there any particular reason why that has occurred?

CHIEF OTTO:

All I know is the Sheriff's Office has put forward this as a Capital Project every year since then and we've been pushing to get it done because the building is falling apart. As DPW explained, there's a lot of different problems that occurred with design changes and with the bidding; I don't know the answer to that question.

LEG. O'LEARY:

During the construction phase, will there be an alternative site or will the prisoners being lodged at the facility go elsewhere or is this structure going to be totally renovated with the new construction of the new building, or what's the plans with respect to that?

CHIEF OTTO:

Yeah, the building is planned to be destroyed, to be raised; there's nothing they can do with it anymore. The new building would be built, okay, right next to the old building and when the new building is functional then they would take down the old building.

LEG. O'LEARY:

So the prisoners would not be lodged elsewhere, they would continue to be lodged in the old facility until the new building is --

CHIEF OTTO:

That's correct.

LEG. O'LEARY:

All right, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Well, I think he might appreciate a little time, right? You want him to go ahead?

LEG. BISHOP:

Yeah, go ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Maybe you's all know the answer to this; this facility, what would you call it, a minimum security facility?

CHIEF OTTO:

The facility is unique in that it has a dormitory setting which they don't approve anymore for any correctional facilities. It's a program, it's a special program that people get sentenced to, you know, by a Judge.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What I'm getting at, Chief Otto, do we have any benchmark? I know, Tedd, we have a number of what a maximum security prison would cost us per square foot; do we have a benchmark to compare this to?

CHIEF OTTO:

When the program was first initiated, the State Commission of Corrections came down, okay, to look at the program and just to get it off, you know, to get something going because it was the first I believe in the State at the time, okay. There's certain concessions they made in the building itself as far as the amount of inmates per officers and the counselors that they have going there. We have been told, okay, that if they do construction, okay, or try to renovate it -- which I'm not certain they can do, you know, it's a DPW question -- that they would have to look very carefully at how the staffing is conducted there.

LEG. LINDSAY:

The original building, isn't the original building a prefabricated building?

CHIEF OTTO:

Yes.

MR. GODEK:

Yes, it's a building of modulars they put by construction; not really a long-term sort of a situation.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Right.

MR. GODEK:

When it was built back in the late 80's it wouldn't have been my recommendation. However, that's the situation that we're faced with right now. The building also sits on soil which we found out recently to be of questionable value, which is probably why these individual module units are shifting and you see the result in structural problem

with them. Parenthetically, part of that -- the reason why we're above or so high in our bids is because we have to remediate a good portion of that soil under the new building and that has added to our construction costs, which was never really anticipated.

LEG. LINDSAY:
How remediated is --

7

MR. GODEK:
It's what they call a control fill situation; we take out the bad stuff, put back in good stuff and compact the daylights out of it.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. But it is -- it's just soft, it's marshy, it isn't polluted or anything, right?

MR. GODEK:
No, no, it just doesn't have the structural bearing capacity that's required for a structure of that type.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. So we don't really know -- I mean, we don't have a benchmark to compare the cost of this to a normal jail of what the numbers --

MR. GODEK:
No, it's not your normal jail situation.

LEG. LINDSAY:
So the best we can figure is we had a bad estimate going in?

MR. GODEK:
That is one consideration, yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:
Educate me to the program itself before I ask about the building. The program, how does it work? Are inmates sent -- do they sleep there or do they just report there; what is the building's function?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Good afternoon. The typical scenario for the DWI Facility is a defendant who has probably endured his third or fourth DWI arrest. Typically that defendant pleads guilty to a felony DWI, typically -- and there are exceptions to all of this but this is the common scenario -- is sentenced to a -- by a County Court Judge or an Acting

County Court Judge to six months in jail and five years probation with alcohol and perhaps narcotics conditions. The six month jail sentence permits about a four month window therapeutic window. That defendant comes into the DWI Facility and in this dormitory setting, that's what makes it -- I guess it can be somewhat analogous to a minimum security prison but no one's built a minimum security prison in New York for many, many years, but it's in a dormitory setting which the Commission of Corrections would no longer permit in any other kind of a correctional facility. They need the dormitory setting because these folks are in program, they're in alcohol treatment program.

The program itself is absolutely akin to the program that you would get if you took a family member and put them into South Oaks or put them into another long-term in-patient alcohol treatment sequence in a rehab center. Typically you can't take a person into the program unless they're sentenced to about at least six months because you can't have them in a program for any less period of term and except to

8

have any results out of it. Today they live together, they're in program together, they are in one-on-one program together, they are in group session together, they have everything that you would expect in an alcohol rehab hospital, and that's what those folks do every day.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you. That's the kind of answer, now I understand what the program is. Now tell me about the history of this particular building where it's housed; was it always used for this, was it constructed originally for this purpose?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Mr. Bishop, I'm the wrong one to ask because I don't remember what it was doing in 1994, even though I was around. I think it had a previous iteration as a County building but I don't know if anybody here knows what it was used for; do you, Chief?

CHIEF OTTO:

Yes, the building was purchased for that specific purpose.

LEG. BISHOP:

It's a non-County building; it was a privately built building, in other words?

LEG. GULDI:

Was this the one that Grumman --

MR. GODEK:

No, the County did have that built, it's on County property.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. So we had it built specifically for this purpose just eight years ago?

MR. GODEK:

No, this is probably 15 or 16 years ago.

LEG. BISHOP:

Oh, okay, I thought 1994 but that's not the first year. So like 20 years ago we built this.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

We're just replacing it.

LEG. BISHOP:

Why do we need -- how much is this filling process costing, is that what's driving up the cost so high?

MR. GODEK:

That is one aspect of it, yes; we're estimating the fill process to cost us somewhere in the vicinity of \$200,000.

LEG. BISHOP:

Oh, that's not -- I mean, that doesn't account for the 150% increase over the last few years.

MR. GODEK:

No, it doesn't, I said it's one aspect.

LEG. BISHOP:

It's just one aspect of it. I was hoping maybe we can just move this building elsewhere. Let me ask you the question that's really on my mind which is why, if we're going to spend \$150 million on a new jail, wouldn't we just build this into the new jail?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

I think the answer to that question is the new jail has only been an idea in the recent past. This need presented itself years ago and became a County project on the books as it were many years before there was any talk of a new jail.

And the second part of my answer would be the place is falling down, literally; it's close to uninhabitable. And I don't think now -- I'm probably the wrong one to ask, I would ask Tedd or his colleagues -- I don't think you could wait long enough and still expect to have this program going anywhere if you're going to wait for the new jail to

open next door.

LEG. BISHOP:

There's no amount of renovation that can be done to hold the fort until you built it into the new jail if that was an option?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

I'm not the right fellow to ask that.

LEG. BISHOP:

I'm addressing that to the architect.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Layman's impression is no.

MR. GODEK:

Given the condition of the building and its original construction type, and that is modular, I would pretty much characterize that as growing good money after bad.

LEG. BISHOP:

Well, I'm looking at the pictures, and I know you said the pictures don't tell the story and now you're going to invite me out there which I -- I'm just telling you, I'm looking at a lot of tile pictures, it's not moving me. But there's a plumbing problem, that's significant I take it and that needs to be addressed; can't we address the plumbing problem, shore up the structure and then incorporate this into the larger jail that, you know, over my objections we're moving forward with; that's not a viable policy option?

MR. GODEK:

It's not a policy option.

LEG. BISHOP:

Why not?

10

MR. GODEK:

Well, I'll further defer to the Sheriff.

LEG. BISHOP:

No, it's a question of you because it's a question of like -- I guess what I'm asking, I'll rephrase it, is is not there some amount of money that can be spent to shore up the structure and repair the plumbing?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Mr. Bishop, I think the answer is certainly our impression has been

since we got there that this place was a wreck and wasn't going to last very long no matter what anybody did. It would probably have to be renovated and maintained for a period of let's say five years to be realistic before you could expect relief in a new facility to take the function of this program and plug it in somewhere else. I'm not the architect, I'm not an engineer, that's not my end of the business, but the impression that we've had reviewing this project over the last 19 months is that's simply not in the cards for this building.

LEG. BISHOP:

Let me ask you about the operating of the building. Wouldn't it, if it were --

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Which one, the new one or the existing one; the proposed new one?

LEG. BISHOP:

The existing one in a -- no, it's a hypothetical question, so.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Okay.

LEG. BISHOP:

If it were a wing in the new facility, in the new jail, if it were incorporated into the design of the new jail, wouldn't there be efficiencies gained in operating expenses as opposed to having it be a separate stand-alone structure?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Tough question to give you a straight answer to. What we have now, to give you a factual framework, you have typically three Correction Officers in this old falling down building that operate that program. I'd be hard-pressed to tell you could we cut it down to two if it was a wing of a larger facility? It's totally speculative, I don't know if I could tell you that's a truthful notion, I simply don't know. But you don't have -- you've got three guys there now, three officers there now.

LEG. BISHOP:

That's it? So one goes on vacation and then --

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Well, no, there's always three, whoever goes on vacation, there are three --

LEG. BISHOP:

Assigned at any time.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
-- assigned at any moment.

LEG. BISHOP:
On duty at all times.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
They also, the Chief just reminded me, because they're in a therapeutic program, they have to be kept separate from the general population.

LEG. BISHOP:
Yeah, of course; I agree with that. It's just that you're building such an expensive building, it would seem to me that you'd want to try to consolidate all your operations as best as possible.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
As I said before, the notion of a newer large jail came up only recently, whereas this project has been kicking around for several years now.

LEG. BISHOP:
You're creative, flexible people, you know, it seems --

LEG. O'LEARY:
Madam Chair?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
I can't tell you how pleased I am to find out you have that opinion, Mr. Bishop.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
I'm waiting for him to -- are you done? Because on this issue, I just wanted to make a comment or really ask a question. Is -- this kind of program, would it be as effective if they were in the jail rather than this alternative facility?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Would the program be as effective?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Right.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
I would say -- and again, I'm treading on someone else's profession, I know the people who give the treatment -- we don't give the treatment, we guard the correctional space and we keep these people indoors until they're allowed to leave. The Probation Department and others provide program. I know they're always very concerned that these folks feel

like they're in a hospital and not a jail. The purpose of this program, which started years and years ago, is to try to persuade people who have already been -- have already intersected with the criminal justice system on numerous occasions and we just can't get

them to stop getting behind the wheel when they have alcohol in them, is to give them a shot before the next time around they either kill somebody or a judge sends them to State penitentiary -- that's the next step after these folks get out -- to try to give them some rehab. That was the notion behind this entire project, I remember it when I was a prosecutor and it started many, many years ago. I know the instinct has been from all of the people who give therapeutic time to these folks is they want them to feel like they're in South Oaks, not Riverhead.

So I'm stepping on someone else's profession but I think if you had those folks here they would tell you, "Don't put them in a big prison, we're not going to have as much success with those folks." But you'd have to ask them.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And I would imagine from the support network of family and everything that that whole situation has gotten to be a lot more tolerable in this stand-alone facility rather than part of Riverhead.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

It's a very different atmosphere. The relationships between the Correction Officers and the inmates are different. Those folks actually try to put their hand out to these folks and try to get them to realize they have to try to save their own lives, and I don't know if that atmosphere could be created in a place that was part of the same brick and mortar that had a maximum security prison attached to it.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Caracappa is next and then Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you. Chief Otto, in the beginning of the summer you sent me some interesting brochures with relation to modulars and how they're being built nowadays for jails; would this be an alternative, would this be a viable alternative? Because from what I saw in the studying I did with all the information you sent me, it looked like top-notch facilities, at half the cost I might add.

CHIEF OTTO:

They're extremely progressive in their thinking, too. As a matter of fact, I know for a fact that one company just moved out to Rocky Point now, they're here in Suffolk County. During the initial stages that was an option, okay, and the architect went with designing a building, so I don't -- you know, it's always an option and we're always willing to look at that, whether it's for a DWI Facility or for a new facility. You know, that's something that DPW would have to address also. We just want a facility that's going to work, that's going to be efficient and that's going to be easy to staff, and whatever people come up with we'll go with.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Right. And I'm sure the last part of that statement would be the most cost effective manner.

13

CHIEF OTTO:

Absolutely.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

So Tedd, I'd ask you, would you be willing to look at the cost differences at this point? Is it too late in the game in your -- from your side of the fence or can we look at the type of modulars that are now being offered to municipalities? I don't know if you have the brochures that Chief Otto has given us, but could we look at that difference and see what the cost difference is before we act on this?

MR. GODEK:

Legislator Caracappa, it actually goes beyond that. And yes, I am familiar with the modulars as we do other brochures. Those modulars work best and are cost effective in a situation where you are replicating cell after cell after cell, as in a detention facility. This program is a dormitory-type program, it's wide open space. Consequently, the modular that you're referring to really doesn't suit itself for this sort of a structure.

And yes, you're right, it is cost effective but, again, on a competitive basis. We're not repeating anything here really, it's a dormitory, it's a wide open area.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

So you wouldn't consider looking at it at this point in time, you feel it would be the wrong direction.

MR. GODEK:

I think it's -- yeah, I personally think it's the wrong direction, as did the architect when we initiated the design.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Yes, by all accounts this seems to be a very worth while program, it's proven its merits over the years; am I correct in assuming that?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

That's the reaction of the judicial community, the legal community, the District Attorney's Office over the course of many, many years. I don't know what the recidivism rate really is, Mr. O'Leary, but I do know that it's -- it or something similar to it is replicated practically nationwide in urban and surburban areas. And to my knowledge, it's the only kind of program, whether it's in jail or out of jail, that is successful in treating people who alcohol problems.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And my point being this is a treatment facility for all intents and purposes, it's not a correctional facility?

14

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

It's a treatment facility while you're in jail; you can't go home at night, you can't sign yourself out because you don't like your therapist. By the way, there is one difference. If you're an obstructionist, if you create a problem in the therapy sessions, if you act up you're taken out of the program and you do the rest of your time in jail. So there's a bigger -- there's a bigger axe held over this person's head than you might get if you took a family member and signed them in to South Oaks and put them in to a similar treatment program. There is a pretty bad downside if you don't pay attention to what you're supposed to be paying attention to.

LEG. O'LEARY:

My point is are we in jeopardy of losing this program because of the condition, the dilapidated condition of the building?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

There's no other place available to the Sheriff to put this program on other than this dilapidated building. And we'll continue this program until the place virtually falls down around our ears, but if we lose that building there's no place else to do this.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Right. And again, if we do lose that building then there will be no

place to house --

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
The program is over.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Okay. Thank you, that's my point.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Legislator Guldi.

LEG. GULDI:
Yeah, you touched on -- you began to touch on my line of questioning by saying that you don't know what the recidivism rates are, and without the recidivism rates are we don't know what the real effect of this program is; do we have that data, do we track it, can we obtain it?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
The Sheriff doesn't track it. I am certain the Probation Department tracks it and perhaps the District Attorney's Office, but I'm not certain about that.

LEG. GULDI:
Okay. Do we know whether or not we're using what's known in the vinacular as a medical model there or a non-medical model? Recidivism or relapse rates are substantially different, that's why I asked the question.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
I'm not certain but I think it's the medical model.

15

LEG. GULDI:
We are -- they are medicating the participants?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Some participants are on psych meds to my knowledge, depending upon -- again, the therapeutic end of this -- there's a bright line which people may not be always aware of. The Sheriff's Office doesn't treat anybody for anything; if you come into the facility with diabetes somebody else treats you, we don't.

LEG. GULDI:
Right.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
So my information about the nature of the therapy that goes on there

is less than full because it's, quite frankly, not under our umbrella at all. My own personal knowledge is I believe people there are treated with medical drugs to the extent that their therapists and their health care professionals decide that they need it.

LEG. GULDI:

All right, so it is under the Probation Department to administer the program?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

And I believe the Health Department.

LEG. GULDI:

Well, who's running the program, the Health Department or the Probation Department?

CHIEF OTTO:

The Sheriff's Office has a staff member there, he works directly for the Sheriff's Office, he's the DWI Coordinator. So he's in charge of the program which is fed, okay, by Judges who sentence these people to attend who attend sessions that some individuals who are employed by the Sheriff's Office, some counselors, and some individuals that are employed by the Probation Department show up. So it's like a joint effort.

One other thing that we haven't brought up which is kind of important to note is that if we extend the size of this, which we're trying to extend from 44 to 85 or so, we also will be able to permit, okay, and give the options to Judges to sentence people who also have drug problems to this. So in other words, if we have room, say it's not filled up with DWI's, we can send people who have certain characteristics and certain classifications to attend this rehab program where they would undergo a similar thing that the people with DWI do. And also, if it's anywhere as half as successful as the DWI program alone, it would benefit the community.

And by the way, I don't have those figures about the recidivism, but I have been involved since '97 and I know there's really very good statistics and I believe I can probably get those for you.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, if you could get those for me. We have an extra week because of the committee cycle versus meeting cycle, I really would like to have that data, and if you could forward it to me I'd appreciate it. For the capacity issue, it's 44 present, we're going to 85 for this proposal.

CHIEF OTTO:
That's correct.

LEG. GULDI:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Any more questions on this? All right, the other thing I wanted to point everyone's attention to was the letter that was sent by the Commission of Corrections regarding the extension of variances. I know there was some discussion on this at the Legislature last time we met and just draw your attention to that last paragraph on page one which basically is giving us an extension for a period of three months, "with the expectation that plans for a permanent solution to Suffolk County's unmet inmate housing needs will materialize. And again, it's imperative that the County continue to make and submit plans during the pendency of the current extension to permanently house in Suffolk on a daily basis." So again, as we debate whether or not to move forward with the permanent solution, I think we need to keep this in mind.

Are there any other questions or comments for the Sheriff?

LEG. LINDSAY:
I do.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Yes, Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Actually, either the Sheriff or Tedd. The planning money was tabled to go forward with the new jail at the last session until November, Dave; when did we table it to, November?

LEG. BISHOP:
November.

LEG. LINDSAY:
What will that do to the effective schedule for the jail and what will that do as far as the variances, if anything?

MR. GODEK:
I can speak to the schedule. The postponement of that appropriation will slow us down a bit. We do have enough money appropriated at this point to begin to program the new facility when an architect is selected. We're in the process of interviewing four perspective design teams and we expect to have them on board in the next couple of months. We do, as I say, have what I might characterize as seat money

appropriated, we can start a contract with them and begin to move forward.

The additional appropriation that you are referencing would have allowed us to do that a little bit more quickly, it would have allowed us to have them take a bigger bite of the project initially. But assuming it is ultimately appropriated, it only slows us down.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Madam Chair, if I may?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:
I'd like an explanation with respect to the variances; that's not an automatic process, is it?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
I don't understand your question, Mr. O'Leary

LEG. O'LEARY:
The variances that are referred to in the letter of August 19th from Commissioner Allan Croce?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Yes?

LEG. O'LEARY:
He indicates that the entitled variances are only for an additional period of three months, so what happens after three months?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Those variances are given, or not, at the discretion of the Commission of Corrections. They made it plain -- this is before you took office, of course -- over the course of last year and the first half of this year that they were -- how do I characterize this correctly -- very anxious that Suffolk County proceed very quickly with an expanded correctional facility. And they made it plain to us by letters such as this and in formal and informal conversations that they were quite willing to start to remove variances from our existing correctional space usage as a prop to get the County moving quickly. They have done that on a modest level over the last several months and you can tell by the tenor of this letter that they're holding those variances, quite frankly, over our head. And it's not for me to predict what their reaction would be to any given delay for any given reason, I don't know. But they certainly have the notion that if the County does not proceed quickly enough according to their perception, that

they will start to remove variances from us which sends us up the New York Thruway taking prisoners to other County facilities.

LEG. O'LEARY:

And my next point is that these variances authorize an additional 107 spaces in the facility. So if the variances are not extended, if we do have those inmates in excess of the authorized numbers, the 107 for

18

example, they will be shipped to other facilities throughout the State?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Unless our population goes down sufficiently which certainly no one could predict that that's likely; it's unlikely. We operate not at capacity all the time but frequently and always close to it. And if the Commission removes 107 or 207 or 307 variances, you've got that many prisoners and no place for them to sleep tonight. You have to get permission from the State Commission to house them alternately even if you can find the space in Erie County or Oneida County or wherever and pay the tuition, you have to get their permission to do so and it's a very expensive proposition, as we've discussed here but not in your presence on many occasions in the past. Chief Otto wants to expand on my comments.

CHIEF OTTO:

What's very important about that letter, it was written before the last Legislative meeting; okay, that's number one. Number two, the letter says it extends the variance for three months, okay, that doesn't mean they have to keep it going for three months, they can pull it tomorrow. I do know that they were informed of what happened at the last legislative meeting and I don't know what action they're going to take but they could take some action. So that letter was written before the last Legislative meeting, okay, I don't know if that's going to continue for three months, okay, and they're concerned right now.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Isn't -- my understanding is that it's not the purpose of variances, the purpose of housing inmates to be on a permanent basis, it's an emergency placement when the numbers exceed the maximum enrollment within the facility, correct?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Under State regulation and State law, variances are ad hoc by definition, they're supposed to be temporary. We've had some for years and years and years. They're used generally for two purposes; because you suddenly spike in your population or perhaps you had a

water main break and you lost three tiers in a prison and you have to find a place to put people. They're also used on a much smaller number basis to move prisoners from one correctional facility to another for safety reasons or security reasons, either for that prisoner or because of the officers and the history with that prisoner; that's a very small number of people on a year to year basis. The situation we're in is that we have long-term variances, a variety of kinds in both facilities which, in fact, have become de facto correctional living spaces. And it was at the beginning of this administration when the State Commissioner came down and said, "This is going to come to a stop now, we're not going to let you do this any more."

LEG. O'LEARY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you.

19

LEG. BISHOP:

You guys got everything on the record?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Let's hope the Commission of Corrections doesn't read our minutes. All right, thank you very much, gentlemen.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I have one other question.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

One other question for the Sheriff's Department; go right ahead, Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, I know, I'm talking a lot today. What about the boat, guys;? The Sheriff's Department got a new boat for out east?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

The Marine Unit?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

I'm very familiar with it, Mr. Lindsay, what would you like to know?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Well, how many boats does the Sheriff's Department have now?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

One that floats.

LEG. LINDSAY:

One that floats, that's this one?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Yes. We have one that we're told by the -- I think it's the United States Army, apparently this is ancient history. Apparently it was excoessed by the United States Army to the Sheriff's Office in the early 70's, it's an amphibious lark, it's got wheels on it and it's in the backyard. And I'm told it hasn't been in the water for many years and we're also warned not to put it in the water because it would sink like an anvil.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So tell us about the new one, what's the new one?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

The new boat -- and I'm not a marina in any sense, so I'm not the one to ask technical questions about the boat. It's an open 28 foot boat, it is manned by two Deputy Sheriffs, it operates one tour a day, daytime tour during the boating season on the Peconic and in Gardiner's Bay, essentially in a triangle between Montauk, Orient and the outfall of the Peconic River.

20

LEG. LINDSAY:

How much did it cost?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

We bought it with Asset Forfeiture money, I think out the door it was under \$120,000 with everything; if I'm off, I'm close. It came out of our Asset Forfeiture Account so drug dealers paid for it.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Why is the Sheriff's Department going into Marine Division at this point? I mean --

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

I can tell you some history.

LEG. LINDSAY:

The only reason I ask that, it seems that --

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

It's a valid question.

LEG. LINDSAY:

-- there's problems in staffing in the Sheriff's Department in a lot of areas; why are we venturing into a new area?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

It's not a new area, first of all, which we didn't know when we got there, quite frankly. We got there and we saw the lark, it's huge, and we wanted to know what's it for and, you know, what is it doing here and what do we do with it. We found out there was a history of a marine unit in the Sheriff's Office that went back many, many years, but it had an up and down history.

The thing that really galvanized the notion to start a Marine Unit was when we found out that the State Police in an inventory -- they do an inventory of all the enforcement organizations in the State of New York and this took on a whole new significance after 9/11/01. They had us down as having a Marine Unit that was available to local law enforcement, available for emergency response, and we found out the Marine unit we had was 30 years old and it didn't float and nobody ever had it in the water for eight or nine years.

Sheriff Tisch, when he found out about that, we started a dialogue, an extensive dialogue with folks on the east end. We had heard anecdotally that there was a tremendous lack of law enforcement presence, especially in the summer time, in the inland waterways of the east end, so we went out and tried to find out what the truth of that was. We met with virtually every single Police Chief in the east end, I think there were 12 or 13 Police Chiefs between the towns and villages of the east end, and the Coast Guard and the security people of Plum Island over the course of several months. And quite frankly, we were encouraged to make a presence, if possible, on the east end and the inland waterways.

With that, the Sheriff took the decision to use our Asset Forfeiture Funds to purchase this boat and that we would start off in a limited way and see how this program went. I can tell you it's been very well perceived on the east end. Mr. Guldi sits here today, I know he's been in support of it, Mr. Caracappa is in support of it, I know Mr. O'Leary has expressed his support of it, that's the east end Legislators. But what we really did to do our homework first was -- and Legislator Caracciolo. What we really did, though, is we went out and talked to the bosses, the Chiefs of every east end Police Department. We have -- it's immodest of me, but the truth is we have glowing letters of support from the entire eastern Long Island law enforcement community.

The cost of it is, in the scheme of things, modest. I'm proud to say we used drug dealer money to buy it and it costs what it costs to put two Deputies on it for about four months a year, one tour a day.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I don't find fault at all with using the forfeiture money for this purpose, I think it's probably putting the money to a good cause. And I'm sure the east end police Chiefs are very happy about this because truthfully it's their responsibility to patrol -- that's part of their policing responsibility on the east end and we're relieving them of some of that responsibility. And I am concerned about not the capital outlay of the boat but the operating budget of the Sheriff's Department in light of everything else that's going on with the jail and the under staffing and the DWI Facility, and it's something that we've talked about as far as operating budgets in the Sheriff's Department. And I just question whether at this point in time it was a good thing for the Sheriff to go in to a whole new area of law enforcement.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Respectfully, I disagree with you, Mr. Lindsay. As I say, the expense in the grand scheme of things is modest; it's two men, one tour a day -- I'm sorry, that was a mistake; two Deputies, one tour day for about four months a year. I can anecdotally tell you we were involved in many rescues. The Coast Guard had their 22 foot boat go down on two occasions that covers that area with irrefutable engine trouble, called upon us, "Can you please pick up the Coast Guard coverage for this large area of water over that period of time?"

LEG. BISHOP:

That's reassuring.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

We pulled people out of the water with broken legs, we took people off sinking boats, we helped extinguish fires aboard vessels. I mean, I'm giving you the puff piece and patting myself on the back, so forgive me, but that's the kind of things our folks were engaged in. And quite frankly, in our perspective it was a small amount of money very well spent.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Just one comment based on what Legislator Lindsay was saying. With all of the communication and meetings that you had with the east end

Police Departments and everything, was there any communication with our Police Department before you went and took on this new initiative?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Well, I know -- I'm hesitating because I know that long before the boat ever saw water, there was extensive communication between us and the Police Department, I'm not certain if it's before we took the decision to go forward. And by the way, we didn't decide to deploy the boat until well after we decided to buy it because we had a boat that people in law enforcement thought we could deploy in an emergency, except it didn't float. So we made the decision to replace that piece of equipment out of Asset Forfeiture well before we decided exactly what we were going to do with it on a day-to-day or month-to-month basis. My sense is long before -- I know it was long before the boat went in the water there were extensive conversations between us and -- in fact, we got advice from the Marine Bureau of the Suffolk County Police Department; Chief Otto would know more about it.

CHIEF OTTO:

The concept of the boat first was just a couple of ideas and we spoke to Suffolk County Police Department on what we thought we wanted to get. It was a unique boat, they never looked at this type of boat before. We had pros and cons going back and forth and we decided, this was in the very early stages, that this is the boat we wanted with all the research we did, we went out to order it, we went through Purchasing, the Police Department became very interested in it. In fact, when it arrived they were there with us to look at the boat and they actually went on a test ride. In fact, one of their boat captains actually handled the boat to look at it, and I believe, I believe that they are trying to get three of those boats now. So it was a joint effort in the beginning.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator O'Leary.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:

Could I make one more comment? We have gone to great lengths since Sheriff Tisch took office to have a day-to-day collegial, constant relationship with the Suffolk County Police Department. There's barely a day that goes by that we are not on the phone or in the presence of the commanders in the Suffolk County Police Department, beyond just this boat. We talk about everything. The days when there was a perceived cultural rivalry between the Sheriff's Office and the Police Department are way back in the rearview mirror, that just doesn't go on, there's barely a week goes by that I'm not on the phone with Chief Robilotto or Commissioner Abbott or someone several times a week.

With regard to this boat, when it was inaugurated and we had a little ceremony, we decommissioned the one that doesn't float, we commissioned the one that did float, I believe either the Chief or a representative from every Chief on the east end was there, Chief Robilotto was there and Chief Compitello was there, in uniform.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Thank you. Legislator O'Leary.

23

LEG. O'LEARY:
Yeah. Just two points, Don. One, what am I in support of?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Pardon me?

LEG. O'LEARY:
What am I in support of?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Which one, Pete?

LEG. O'LEARY:
No, you had alluded to me being in support of the Marine Bureau in the Sheriff's Department, is that what I heard?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:
All right, let me just -- just one question. I mean, I'm encouraged over the fact that the Police Chiefs on the east end support this program and the implementation of a vote from the Sheriff's Department. I'm more concerned about what the labor force of police officers in the east end, what their reaction to this is, what has been the reaction of the unions, the Police unions?

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
Silence. In my experience -- and God knows, Pete, you know better than me -- that if there were union presidents that had a problem with anything that was going on, the reaction is not silence. The truth is that the rank and file level we've had officers, I don't want to say from every single Police Department on the east end because some of them are only a handful of officers, but close to every Police Department on the east end have been on and off our boat, we're cross-training with people. We have not had one instance, report, telephone call, comment at a barbeque that I am aware of, and I would be aware of anyone either in the labor field in police work or from the Police Departments or from the town leaders, the political leaders or the Legislators on the east end; I haven't heard one word of criticism since we put the boat in the water. And I think if Charlie {McCardle} or his colleagues were concerned with what we were doing, and had gone to great lengths to lay the ground work before we made

the decision and I think that worked because we haven't had a complaint from anybody about anything.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Quickly, and I don't need a response from anybody. I just want to take this opportunity on the record to thank the Sheriff's Department for cooperating, especially Undersheriff Denzler, with {Puelter and

24

Bogart} who's doing our needs assessment work, the study. I was speaking with them the other day, they said that you've been more than accommodating and that goes a way for us and of course we're getting information back to us so that we can have that dual track effort of building a new facility on line. Thank you.

UNDERSHERIFF SULLIVAN:
You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Thank you very much, gentlemen.

LEG. BISHOP:
Madam Chair, I have a question but not of the Sheriff's Office.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
All right, you may leave then. If the Police Department would come forward in the meantime, because I know one of the Legislators has --

LEG. BISHOP:
Just to the Budget Review Office regarding the Sheriff's Department. What is the overtime allocation in 2003 for the Sheriff's Department?

MR. DUFFY:
I don't have that.

LEG. BISHOP:
Can you get that for me and find out how much has been spent this year?

MR. DUFFY:
Okay.

LEG. BISHOP:
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Before we move to the agenda and as the members of the Police Department come forward, there is a copy of a communication that's been distributed also that came from Deputy Police Commissioner Jim Abbott regarding the request made by Legislators Bishop and Crecca about auto accidents and summons activity. It was the information you requested; the second page, it was attached. And if you gentlemen have any -- Commissioner Abbott, if you want to, since you offered it, address it.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

Yes, thank you. At the request of Legislators Bishop and Crecca, we did an analysis of the summons activity vis-a-vis motor vehicle accidents throughout the district on the parameters of months as close as we can get them using the electronic systems. You'll see on the summonses which is the second page of the communication, all summons activity 2002 vis-a-vis 2003. The summons activity is up approximately 35,000 which represents a 16.18% increase in summons activity.

25

If you go through the next page, actually the statistics are off by a month; I was told that was not an anomaly but that's the way it came back out of the system. But if you go down the left hand column, you'll see it's by precinct which I think Legislator Bishop and Crecca both asked for. In the 1st Precinct we had overall motor vehicle accidents were reduced on the respective periods of January 1st, '03 to 8/31/03 vis-a-vis the same period in 2002, the same periods in 2002. So in the 1st Precinct the motor vehicle accidents totally were down 459 during that period of time. And if you go down the respective precincts; the 2nd, they were down 445 -- I'm sorry, they were down 431 in the 1st; 353 in the 2nd; 460 in the 3rd Precinct; 535 in the 4th Precinct; 267 in the 5th; down 743 in the 6th; they were up five in the 7th Precinct; in the highway, they were up by 277. The totals on the bottom, the total accidents were down in the respective periods by 2,075, that includes all accidents from fatals to serious physical injury to a fender bender at Christmas time in the parking lots. The motor vehicle fatals were down 17 and the serious physical injury were down 415. Now, the grand total is they were down, as I said, 2,507 in the respective period of time.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Can I question on the statistics?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay, certainly, go right ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Is there any kind of quantitative correlation between increase in summonses and decrease in accidents?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Yes, in terms of the quantitative correlation, strictly speaking the numbers, the summons --

LEG. LINDSAY:

This is what --

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

There is a coefficient between summonses going up and accidents going down.

LEG. LINDSAY:

This is a sampling of one year, but if summonses continue to go up would we -- you're going to see accidents go down?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Well, I don't know, you know, I don't want to get into a realm of what if and the future, but I think it's a known fact in law enforcement that the more you concentrate an area, concentrate on areas where there are high accident locations, and we have those based on our planning and analysis, a lot of the summons activity, if you were to chart it out you'd find it is in -- it takes place in the precincts in intersections where there's a history of serious physical injury and a history of aggressive driving and high accident activity in that particular area at that intersection, along that strip of road, whatever. And by concentrating your -- in effect, concentrating your

resources on those areas, I think it would be safe to say I don't know that you can do a mathematically certain model but I think you could have a high probability level. With the high level of activity in an area, the accident rate goes down because people are more conscious of the fact that there are police on a regular basis patrolling that area.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

LEG. BISHOP:

I have a question.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

I can't guarantee, you know, I couldn't take any one number and guarantee that that's it, but I think you can be safe in that the mathematics would prove out that summonses do reduce accidents when they're given out in intensified manners such as we are doing.

LEG. BISHOP:
I --

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Could you gentlemen just share the codes to the left?

LEG. BISHOP:
You're not recognizing me? Put me on the list.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Absolutely.

LEG. BISHOP:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Just relax.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
I'm sorry, what?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
511, 1180, the code numbers that are along the left.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Oh, what the codes are?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Yeah.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
511 is an impound -- 511 impound is an aggravated unlicensed operation of a motor vehicle which justifies or allows for the department, the officer making the -- and a summons is a form of arrest, so the officer making the arrest in the form of a summons can impound the vehicle.

27

LEG. CARACAPPA:
1180?

LIEUTENANT PAPAVERO:
It should be speeding.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

I think it's excessive --

LEG. O'LEARY:

Speed.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Thank you, Legislator O'Leary; excessive speed, speeding in excess of the speed limit.

LEG. O'LEARY:

It's only been 20 years but I know that the last time I wrote a summons.

LEG. CRECCA:

I used to represent clients who at times went above the speed limit.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And VTL I guess is Vehicle Traffic Law?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Vehicle Traffic Law, a summons written against a Vehicle and Traffic Law, VTL.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And then all other, what would be that?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Summonses that are written for parking or unsafe conditions.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay, thank you. Legislator Bishop --

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

-- if Legislator Lindsay is done.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay, Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

I appreciate that. The reason that like the 3rd Precinct is able to

increase by I guess it's a third, it's summoning activity comparing year-to-year; is there a reason for that, are they recipients of traffic enforcement grants or is there -- I see Babylon Precinct and the Huntington Precinct have actually had a decline in summons activity -- Babylon is fairly flat but the Huntington one is notable -- but the increase in the third is remarkable.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

Well, I think it's a combination of factors. As the Commissioner mentioned before, we do track these high accident locations on computers. That's up to the Commanding Officer and the Chief of Patrol to decide where the allocation of resources is going to be to reduce those. So the problem might have been more specific or more heightened in the 3rd Precinct and it will send people down there for a specific period of time. It could also be other things such as COPE or plain clothesman down there for narcotics arrest, it would stop people and give summonses in those instances. So it's a fluid motion. I don't think you can give a specific answer as to why these numbers are the way they are.

LEG. BISHOP:

Well, how do you evaluate who's doing a good job at this and who's doing a poor job?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

Well, constant review, constant review and analysis, dialogue with the Precinct Commanders, statistical analysis, finding out where the accidents occur, the serious physical injuries, the fatals and all the rest.

LEG. BISHOP:

And so what does that review tell you of this statistical; is this helpful in that?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Or is this just -- you know, it's just ceding to my request?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

It would be akin to something -- I hate to use the word because people are fearful of it, the {comstat} process. It's a look at a picture in time of what's going on in a particular location and whether the Commissioner should allocate his resources at that time and place.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

So it's a very fluid program.

LEG. BISHOP:

Well, I appreciate that, I think that's exactly what you should be doing. What I'm asking is -- I mean, what does it tell you that when one precinct has a 33% increase and the other has a decrease and, by

29

the way, the precinct that had a decrease had an increase in its injuries, serious accidents, because that's what I associate injuries with serious accidents. I'm not saying my precinct is not doing well, I just want to know is --

LEG. LINDSAY:

It correlates to the Legislator.

LEG. BISHOP:

Yeah, does it correlate to the Legislator, is it my fault or is it that the 3rd is doing something so well that we should be doing it in first?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

I think what happens in the Patrol Division, Legislator Bishop, is that these numbers are then taken on regular meetings with the Chief of Patrol, you know, the Chief of Patrol meets regularly with his -- in effect, his staff who are or Precinct Commanders and the executive officers, and those kinds of questions that you're raising are brought up. You know, is there -- what is the factor that has allowed for an increase in one precinct, a decrease in another? It could be any number of variables.

LEG. BISHOP:

We don't know it for -- okay. So I understand, that's the same answer that --

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

On a day-to-day or week-to-week basis, you know, one precinct may have more of you, if you will, they may have more of the tighter activity that takes them away from summons enforcement. They may have a season or a period of time when they're involved in street fares, parades, kinds of activity that take the kind of work that a COPE officer can do in one precinct where he's concentrating on summons activity away from that concentration in another precinct. What the Chief of Patrol is responsible for under our status or Commissioner Abbott's, it's our

version of comstat, what he is responsible for is to see to it -- to ask the whys and if he -- you know, why is this precinct in this condition and that precinct that condition? And if he's not satisfied to continue pressing the Precinct Commander as to hold them accountable; they are held accountable for their summons activity. To my knowledge, nothing has been brought up to my level, that the activity in, let's say, the 1st is -- you know, has been a cause for concern.

LEG. BISHOP:

It may not be that the first is doing something poorly, it may be that the 3rd is doing something well.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Absolutely.

LEG. BISHOP:

So what I want to know perhaps next time or you can do another graph, is there an analysis of this that has the answer to that question; why would one precinct have a third more increase? It because they're

30

doing something very well? And maybe that should be brought to the 1st or maybe they're getting particular assistance from headquarters. You know, I just want to understand why it's happening.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

All right. One of the purposes of the Chief of Patrol staff exists for that very reason. When everybody is in the same room, to correlate between what's going on in one precinct to another so that they can share. And to my knowledge, that's done regularly, what are you doing that is making your operation more successful than ours? I will find out if there is anything about the 3rd. Make a note of that, please, find out is the 3rd's increase summons activity in any way a function of something they're doing that other precincts should be imitating? But as I said, to date I have not been given an alert in effect on the part of the Chief of Patrol's office that something is going on that they're concerned about as to the activity, the summons activity from precinct to precinct. And it is something that's very high on his scope because he does have a very -- he's had an intense interest in traffic enforcement for some time now, Chief Compitello.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Something a little different.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Certainly, go right ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:

A couple of weeks ago there was a stop on the Expressway I believe that just targeted motorcycles; what was the rationale for that? The reason I'm asking is I had a constituent that went out of his mind with me on the phone for about 15 minutes that we're discriminating against motorcycle drivers and bah, bah, bah, bah, bah.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Well, I know, that's been the reaction in the past. First of all, we have very carefully looked into it, we've researched this with the legal department there and very carefully ascertained that there is -- it's a perfectly legitimate activity for a Police Department to take a specific type of vehicle and to do a vehicle check, you know, a safety check on those vehicles. The rationale behind it is those vehicles, like any other vehicle on the road, are subject to police inspection, the law allows us to do that. Do we sometimes take a class or category of vehicles and separate them out? Yes, truck stops for example, the common truck stop, you'll see those on the Expressway at Exit 66 there's a truck stop. All trucks, all trucks, the law says you can do it as long as do you not discriminate in any way by being in any way arbitrary and capricious as to who you stop. So in the case of truck stops, we stop all trucks, they're inspected for safety checks.

In the case of motorcycles, the same exact reason, we stop them because they're a class of vehicle that we think needs to be inspected regularly for safety checks and that we're legitimately able to do so.

31

We're not discriminating, we're not picking on them, we're taking them as a category of vehicle and stopping them. When we do DWI stops, when we do those stops, we take -- the consistency pattern has to be all or a consistent number of all; obviously you can't stop every car on the road but you stop every third car. And the reason is strictly safety. This is not -- there's nothing more sinister to this than these vehicles are -- they constitute to themselves and to the general public a higher risk of safety if they're not properly -- because you have less of a vehicle to control, you have the higher probability if something goes wrong that it's going to go seriously wrong. So that's why we stop the motorcycles.

LEG. BISHOP:

Madam Chair, I apologize, I have to leave at this time. I reviewed the agenda and I assume all those resolutions are passing, please add my vote to the majority.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

If we are legally permitted to do so, I will. Thank you.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Madam Chair?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Just, Pete, to follow-up on this. Just a guess off the top of my head to the constituent, I thought it might -- the reason for the motorcycle stop was because we had a higher amount of fatalities earlier in the summer, didn't we, with motorcycles? Didn't we have a stretch there where we had like six fatalities or more in a short period of time?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

There was one weekend where we had three in one weekend.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Is there a correlation between the stop in the fatalities?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Sometimes if there's a higher incidence of serious physical injury, if it's fatalities we may decide to do a motorcycle check at times, other times it's just the routine rotation of who we're going to be stopping and checking.

By the way, when the stops are made, if your papers are in order and if your vehicle is up to the safety standards that are required of a motorcycle, you're out of there in a few minutes. I can attest to that personally. I've stopped -- after the first one and after some of the protests there were lodged with my office after the first stop, I made a point to go out to it the second time it was done on the Expressway and spent about two hours watching it and, you know, I can attest. I mean, if you're all correct and both your paperwork obviously and the safety features that are required on the vehicle, you're in and out of there, it's like a revolving door. The ones who get held up are obviously the motorcycles who I think perhaps are most annoyed. Some are annoyed just at being stopped. They do feel they're being picked on, but I have to say, I don't believe it's

picking on them, I think it's just taking a class of vehicle that does have a higher potential, if you will, for serious physical injury. You can just attest from common sense that a motorcycle in an accident pushes both the motorcycle rider, any passengers and anybody else involved in the accident at a higher risk.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Commissioner, just to clarify the graph with respect to summonses issued. One of my colleagues seems to be -- at least it's my opinion that he's concerned about perhaps the deployment of personnel from one precinct to another, and that is a direct correlation with respect to the UTT's that are written. However, to clarify with respect to the Highway Patrol personnel, and I'm assuming the MAR is Marine Bureau?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Okay. Isn't it a fact that it's not just on the Expressway that the Highway Patrol works, they're all over the County.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:
So, in effect, some of the summonses at the higher patrol issue can be within the various six precincts. And I say six, not seven, which is my next question, but I'll go to that. Isn't that a fact?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Yes, absolutely. When we did the beginning of this summer, I think either April or May, we started our Operation SITE, Suffolk Intense Traffic Enforcement -- Suffolk Intensified Traffic Enforcement. Operation SITE involved adding additional personnel to the Highway Patrol Bureau, taken out of the routine patrol and put into the Highway Patrol Bureau, and those additional officers were assigned not only to the highways but also to off-road, off-highway locations in each of the precincts.

LEG. O'LEARY:
So it's likely that a good number of those summonses issued in the year 2003, 40,000, were within the precinct boundaries and not necessarily on the major highways.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Yes, they're not necessarily in the major highways. I don't know what numbers, what the proportion is between the two but you have to figure with six precincts involved, you know, a good number are in the precincts.

LEG. O'LEARY:
And just one other question. How do you arrive at the numbers in the 7th Precinct when there isn't any 7th Precinct; is that COPE?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

I think they take the -- yeah, the COPE Unit which is the 7th Precinct unit.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

Highway.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

And the highway units that do -- some of which do get assigned to the 7th Precinct, the geographic 7th Precinct boundary.

LEG. O'LEARY:

But not necessarily the 5th and 6th Precinct sector cars that are currently assigned to that area.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

To my knowledge, they are reported under the 5th and 6th Precincts.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Legislator Caracappa and then we'll go right to the agenda.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'm sorry, to go back to the motorcycle questioning. When you set up the motorcycle stops, it's come to my attention that you actually divert traffic that's going in the opposite direction to get off and come around -- go over the overpass and come back to the area where you had the setup. As opposed to keeping it in one direction, you made them get off, go back and then head the opposite direction to be inspected; that was kind of --

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

I don't believe that's true. If it happened I'll stand corrected, but I'm almost certain -- just common -- you know, just the practicality of it, I don't think the -- the one I watched, we did not bring anybody around on -- the one I watched was in the eastbound direction of the Long Island Expressway, nobody was taken off the road westbound and told to come back and go eastbound. The only even remote possibility I could see of that happening was if a motorcycle was observed going into the opposite -- you know, actually crossing over to the opposite direction of traffic in order to avoid being stopped, then I can see the officers involved being a little curious as to why that was done and getting the motorcyclist to come back to be inspected. But I'll double check on that but I can't imagine that

being the routine, I believe it was always the direction in which the motorcycles are traveling, not the opposite.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'd appreciate it if you did look into that and find out if that was the case. And if so, in the future if you could give consideration to -- if you're going to do the stops, to make it as convenient as possible for the motorists. Thank you.

34

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Thank you.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I got one more question.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

This is like the final question of the day?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Final question.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Okay, good.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Are we having any problems with our communication system, especially on the north shore, with dead spots?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

There has been a continuous -- it's an ongoing problem that certain areas on the north shore, because of the geography of that area, you know, I know the ones that I particularly am aware of is Huntington obviously --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Didn't we just appropriate some money for a new tower up there?

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:

I think we needed an offset on that.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER MAGGIO:

No, we have a Capital Project to correct that.

LEG. LINDSAY:

That's moving forward, right?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER MAGGIO:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
So will that solve the problem in the Huntington area?

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER MAGGIO:
We're hoping.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes, hopefully.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Hopefully.

35

LEG. LINDSAY:
What do we need to solve the problem in the rest of the north shore areas?

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
I know in Shoreham and Rocky point there's been continuing transmission problems. I don't know if the towers that are being anticipated whether we've resolved those problems; does anybody know if they are --

LIEUTENANT PAPAVERO:
I think it's the repeater up in Lloyd Harbor, the repeater in Huntington area and they're going to have public hearing on that before they go ahead with it.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
All right, that's the Huntington area, just to repeat for the --

LEG. LINDSAY:
But is anybody doing an analysis on the whole communication system to solve the --

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
No, we have --

LEG. LINDSAY:
Because that's a scary thing if some of our officers are out there and their communications doesn't work.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

No, this is not something that -- you know, it's been going on, it's a geographic problem, it's a wireless communication problem due to the topography of the areas that are involved. And in fact, just before I came here I presented a department citation to Vincent Style who's the head of our whole communications, wireless communication section. He's probably -- and I really -- I think Legislator O'Leary would -- Vincent Style is probably the leading expert in the United States of America on wireless communications. He is a cited expert, he is President of the International Association of Public Communication Officers. I mean, he's called upon constantly for his expertise in problem areas all over the country, and I know when I go to Major Chiefs meetings his name is cited constantly at our meetings.

And so with all that hoopla about him, what I'm trying to -- pointing out is I have the best guy that you can get working on these problems and they are problems that are not easy to solve, it's not only just repeaters, it's the topography of the area itself. You know, if you go off into certain parts of the north shore you're going to find FM and AM transmissions are going to go down, you know, your radio, put your radio on at certain parts of the north shore and it won't work, your AM radio will not work. So it's not just us, you know, it's just the way the land was laid out. And if we can find a solution I think, you know, we're constantly tinkering with it to get a solution.

36

In the north shore, at least on the east end, we do have repeaters in Shoreham. We have an actual channel on our radios, it's the Shoreham channel which is a repeater in case the officer cannot get through on the normal channel that he's on he goes over to Shoreham if he's in the 6th Precinct, the so called Shoreham channel. All I can tell you, Legislator Lindsay, is that it's a problem we're aware of, it hadn't just arrived, it hasn't just come up, it's an ongoing problem. We don't yet have it -- we don't have it licked a hundred percent, no.

LEG. LINDSAY:

But somebody is working on it to try and figure it out.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

Oh, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

If I could, just to reinforce what Legislator Lindsay is saying. I know I had had a conversation earlier with the Deputy Commissioner about this and that perhaps if it is a money issue we can look at trying to tap into some homeland security dollars for doing that. But I think it's imperative that we try to move forward with getting the answers so that if it is, as I'm sure it is, a matter of dollars and cents that we can see that the necessary dollars are in the budget

that the County Executive sends over to the Legislature.

LIEUTENANT PAPAVERO:
Can I point out one thing?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Sure. Could you just -- yeah.

LIEUTENANT PAPAVERO:
Another problem that we have is we have a lot of the areas identified where we could use a repeater station but we can't put it in. In one case, Caumsett State Park we need State Park permission and we're having difficulties and delays in getting that. So it's also a problem putting up an antenna.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
But I think, too, that if we can make the case that we're talking about security issues. This is not just, you know, for the convenience of someone using their cell phone to call home, that security is being jeopardized and compromised if we don't have this in place.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
Well, hopefully we can. I know in the case that Lieutenant Papvanhous, the officer that's here --

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ABBOTT:
Papavero.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
That we -- oh, Papavero, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
He has trouble with those Italian names, don't worry about it.

37

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
That yeah, we've had -- sometimes it's difficult getting the permission to put the tower up. I mean, the one at Caumsett State Park, it's been a back and forth dialogue for some months now between ourselves and the State Park administrators.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
All right, thank you very much. Let us go to the agenda. And Legislator Bishop had to leave but asked that he be included with the majority; if legally we are permitted to do that, I don't really know the answer to that so we'll have to check that, but if so, I don't have a problem with it, but we need to check and see if legally we can do that. Okay, we'll go to the Tabled Resolutions.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1380-03 - Amending the 2003 Capital Budget & Program and appropriating funds in connection with the renovation, construction and additions to the 6th Precinct (CP 3184) (County Executive). I know a corrected copy is being filed on the offset and is being done in a timely fashion so that we can act on this at the next meeting. So I'd like to make a motion to approve.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor?

LEG. LINDSAY:
What is the offset now?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
The offset now is a variety of offsets. Doug, do you have a copy of that resolution?

LEG. CRECCA:
What number is it?

LEG. CARACAPPA:
1380.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
It was the red light running camera and it has been changed to some acquisition monies from a reconstruction project on Bay Shore Road in my district that I've been told, and I will ask for it in writing from the Department of Public Works, that it is not needy and necessary. Also the same with Motor Parkway, 5,000 from that, and another \$100,000 or 80,000 from the renovations to Building 50 in Hauppauge.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
All righty? I made that motion, we had a second. All those in favor? Opposed? It is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

1460-03 - Modifying Universal Child Sexual Abuse Reporting Policy for State mandated reporters at Suffolk County Contract Agencies (Cooper). Is there a motion? I'll make a motion to table, I know that there

have been some questions here, and then we'll check with the sponsor on this. Motion to table, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? The resolution is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

Introductory Resolutions

1734-03 - Renaming Pine Aire Drive at North Bay Shore/Brentwood as "Rahem Heigher Drive" (Carpenter). This is a ceremonial naming.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What happened to 1532?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

This young gentleman was the first Long Island soldier to die in action in Iraq and he happened to live on Pine Aire Drive. Motion by Legislator -- me and second by Legislator Caracappa. All those in favor? Opposed? Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

1740-03 - Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$35,000 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justices Services for the Suffolk County Police Department to continue the Huntington Station Annex Program with 75% support (County Executive). Motion by Legislator Guldi, second by Legislator Crecca. All those in favor? Opposed? Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

1741-03 - Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the New York State Office of Emergency Management, the New York State Division of Military and Naval Affairs for a Suffolk County Citizens Corps Council Program (County Executive). I'd like to thank the Commissioner Fischler who is here with Tom O'Hara, we appreciate the gesture of respect. Motion by myself, second by Legislator Lindsay. All those in favor?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Place on the consent calendar?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

And place on the consent calendar. In favor? Opposed?

It is approved and placed on the consent calendar (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

1742-03 - Transferring and appropriating funds from the 1% Bail Fee Account into the Department of Probation to implement an Alternative to Incarceration Program to reduce jail overcrowding and authorizing the County Executive to execute related agreements (County Executive).

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:

Motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Guldi. All those

in favor? Opposed? Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

39

LEG. CRECCA:
Is this eligible?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
I don't know, it's a transfer of funds, no.
1743-03 - Accepting the donation of two (2) two-passenger year 2002 vehicles for the Suffolk County Police Department (County Executive). These are those gem vehicles.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Where are we getting them from, is the school district donating the vehicles to us?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
No, very cute.

LEG. GULDI:
Only charging us 200 bucks a piece.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
No, it's the manufacturer that's doing the donation.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:
I think that's a one way street, Legislator Lindsay. This is from the manufacturer, they're like golf cart type vehicles.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Yeah, they've been donating to a number of municipalities and departments.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Can I ask a question regarding those vehicles?

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Yes.

LEG. O'LEARY:
What is the department's plan and how are they going to utilize those vehicles and where?

LEG. CRECCA:
High speed chases.

COMMISSIONER GALLAGHER:

We're going to use them -- they're going to be used at McArthur Airport for airport parameter patrol around McArthur Airport.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Okay, good.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
And they're very quiet. Okay, motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Crecca. All those in favor? Opposed?
Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

40

IR 1750-03 - Accepting and appropriating 100% grant funds from the New York State Office of Emergency Management of the New York State Division of Military and Naval Affairs for a Suffolk County Community Emergency Response Team Program (County Executive). Motion by myself, second by Legislator Caracappa. All those in favor? Opposed?
Approved and placed on the consent calendar (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

1751-03 - Amending the 2003 Capital Budget & Program and appropriating funds in connection with the replacement of County DWI Alternative Facility (CP 3044) (County Executive). I think the case certainly was made here today. I make that motion.

LEG. O'LEARY:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON CARPENTER:
Second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed?
Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).

Thank you very much. Meeting is adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 P.M.*)

Legislator Angie Carpenter, Chairperson
Public Safety & Public Information Committee

41